Remarks

As of the issuance of the Office's Official Communication, claims 1-30 were pending with claims 1 and 16 being the only independent claims. The Office has rejected each of the claims.

Paragraph 3

The Office has rejected claim 20, stating that the limitations of "specified filtering criterion" and "The computer readable medium" lack antecedent basis. The Office points out that dependent claim 20, recites being dependent from claim 15 but actually appears to depend from claim 19. The Office has indicated that the applicant can overcome this rejection by amending claim 20 to depend from claim 19. The applicant has made such an amendment.

Paragraph 6

The Office has rejected claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. section 101 stating that the claims are directed towards non-statutory subject matter alleging that they merely disclose a series of manual and/or mental steps. The Office has suggested that amending the preamble of the claims to read "A computer executable method for ..." would overcome this rejection. Without addressing the particular merit of this rejection, the applicant has made such an amendment.

Paragraph 8

The Office has rejected claims 1-30 Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huck in view of Weigel. The applicants hereby traverse the Offices rejection of the claims.

With regards to independent claim 1, the Office alleges that Huck teaches a method of wrapper generation (JEDI) for extracting data from documents and that the method includes creating grammars for identifying patterns of symbols. The Office further alleges that such

teachings are the same as the claimed invention. The applicant respectfully disagrees. Huck does teach a method for parsing text including the use of grammars and pattern identification; however, the entire field of pattern matching is a rather large and complex discipline and although Huck relates to one method or technique that can be employed in this technological field, it in no way describes, suggests or teaches each of the claimed elements nor does it render the entire field of pattern matching as obvious.

Claim 1 specifically recites the element of a pattern of symbols to be matched in which the pattern contains a prefix pattern, a value pattern, and a suffix pattern. Thus, the pattern to be matched is partitioned into three segments. Claim 1 further recites identifying candidate matches for the pattern in a string, with each candidate match including a candidate match for the prefix pattern, the value pattern and the suffix pattern. Huck does not contain any similarity to such a process. Huck teaches pattern recognition but does not describe, suggest or teach the element of a pattern that is partitioned into a prefix, value and suffix and then searching the string for candidate matches that include the same three portions. In addition, given the Huck reference and its description of pattern matching, using such a technique would not have been obvious. This technique not only is focused on identifying certain types of textual constructs within a string, but also has the added benefit of being able to apply weighted importance to various aspects of the pattern being searched (as recited more particularly in claim 10).

The Office admits that Huck does not teach the element of determining a "cost" associated with choosing a "best" ranked solution (candidate match) but alleges that Weigel teaches automatic determination of edit costs and that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply Weigel to Huck. The applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office. First of all, Huck describes a method for extracting and synthesizing information from

06002.1005 ROA mailed 06.14.04   -9-

the Web. Weigel describes determining the words of a textual source by comparing to words through a dictionary look-up process. The applicants submit that there is no clear motivation to combine these two technologies. Furthermore, based on the fact that Weigel was published almost three years prior to Huck, was published in the same trade journal as Huck, and was written and submitted by a German company – as was Huck, that if there had been any motivation to combine the two technologies, that it clearly would have been mentioned in Huck, or Huck would have at least referenced Weigel.

Furthermore, even assuming *in arguendo* that it would have been obvious to combine Huck and Weigel, the applicants respectfully submit that even the combination of the two references does not result in a disclosure of the present invention as recited in claim 1. There is no suggestion in the combined references of search a string for matches to a pattern by identifying matches of a prefix pattern, value pattern and suffix pattern. There is no suggestion of identifying an individual cost to each such portion of the pattern – Weigel only matches words in a document with words in a dictionary – this is very different than identifying partitions of a pattern (prefix, value and suffix) with an unstructured string. Thus, the present invention does not merely seek to match an entire pattern, but rather operates to create partitions of a pattern (prefix, value, suffix) and match these individual partitions in the string.

Thus, the applicants respectfully submit that the reference cited and relied on by the Office do not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness and furthermore, that a combination of the cited references do not render the invention as recited in claim 1, obvious.

With regards to claim 4, the Office alleges that Huck teaches the generation of all possible solutions is a disclosure of the claimed "spans of interest". The applicant respectfully disagrees. As described in the specification on page 14, lines 14-32, the span of interest involves

06002.1005 ROA mailed 06.14.04   -10-

identifying value patterns in the string that meet certain filtering criteria, such as formatting, and then focusing the search on or about the matching value patterns (i.e., spans of interest). The Office's characterization of the "spans of interest" as "all possible solutions" indicates a misunderstanding of the claimed technology. In fact, the claimed "spans of interest" limits the search space as opposed to expanding the search space as is implied by the Office. Thus, the applicant respectfully submits that claim 4 is not obvious in view of Huck and should be allowed.

With regards to claim 5, the Office alleges that Huck teaching the use of a query of extracted data is the same as the claimed use of keywords as a filtering criterion. The applicant respectfully submits that the example cited by the Office has absolutely no relationship whatsoever to the invention recited in claim 5. The fact that a query may use a keyword has absolutely not connotations whatsoever of using keywords in a filtering criterion for identifying spans of interest for a string search. Thus, the applicant respectfully requests the Office to retract this rejection as the claim is allowable.

With regards to claims 6-15, rather than addressing the individual allegations by the Office the applicant respectfully submits that they depend from a clearly allowable claim 1 and thus, are also in condition for allowance.

The applicant respectfully requests the Office to allow claim 1 and the claims depending there from. The references cited by the Office do not disclose each and every element of the claims and, when taken in combination do not render the present invention obvious.

The applicant respectfully submits that claims 16-30 are similar in scope to claims 1-14 and thus, are also in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

The applicant has amended claims 1-15 to overcome the Offices 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection.

The applicant has amended claim 20 to overcome the Offices 35 U.S.C. 112 rejection. The

applicant has submitted arguments regarding claim 1, that equally apply to independent claim 16,

that clearly traverse the Offices rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). The applicant has submitted

further arguments with regards to claims 4 and 5; however, these claims as well as the remaining

claims depend either directly or indirectly from independent claims 1 and 16. Because claims 1

and 16 are allowable, these claims are also in condition for allowance. Thus, the applicant

respectfully submits that all claims are in condition for allowance and that the Office's Official

Communication has been fully addressed. The applicant respectfully requests that the case be

processed to issuance in accordance with Patent Office Business.

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____

Gregory Scott Smith
Reg. No. 40,819
Attorney for Applicant

Gregory Scott Smith LLC
PO Box 88148
Atlanta, Georgia 30356
(770) 804-9070

06002.1005 ROA mailed 06.14.04   -12-